

**APPROVED 8-19-04**



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD  
KIVA - CITY HALL  
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD  
JULY 8, 2004  
MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Wayne Ecton, Council Member  
E.L. Cortez, Vice Chairman  
David Gulino Commission Member  
Michael D'Andrea, Design Member  
Anne Gale, Design Member  
Jeremy Jones, Design Member  
Michael Schmitt, Design Member

**STAFF:** Suzanne Colver  
Tim Curtis  
Randy Grant  
Kurt Jones  
Bill Verschuren  
Al Ward  
Greg Williams

**CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Ecton at 1:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

**OPENING STATEMENT**

**COUNCILMAN ECTON** read the opening statement that describes the role of the Development Review Board and the procedures used in conducting this meeting.

## **MINUTES APPROVAL**

June 17, 2004 DRB Minutes

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JUNE 17, 2004, MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED. SECOND BY MR. JONES.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

**COUNCILMAN ECTON** reported that case 11-DR-2004 has been continued and cases 20-DR-2004, 35-DR-2004, and 39-DR-2004 have been moved to the regular agenda.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

99-DR-2003                      St. Mark Coptic Orthodox Church Remodel  
Site Plan & Elevations  
525 N 74<sup>th</sup> Street  
Barsoum Barsoum, Architect/Designer

8-DR-2004                      94 Hundred Shea  
Site Plan & Elevations  
9400 E Shea Blvd.  
Patrick Hayes Architecture,  
Architect/Designer

20-DR-2004                      Troon North Condominiums  
Site Plan & Elevations  
28713 N 102<sup>nd</sup> Place  
GCH Limited, Architect/Designer

(PULLED TO REGULAR AGENDA)

23-DR-2004                      Sprint PH60XC104 Traffic Signal Pole WCF  
Site Plan & Elevations  
8749 E McDonald Drive  
Young Design Corp Architects,  
Architect/Designer

31-DR-2004                      Verizon Wireless – PHO Caribbean  
Site Plan, Elevations & Landscape  
9702 E. Bell Road

32-DR-2004                      Mansourian Building

**APPROVED 8-19-2004**

Site Plan & Elevations  
2899 N. 887<sup>th</sup> Street  
Gerald Deines Architect, Architect/Designer

34-DR-2004                      DC Ranch Courtyards at Desert Park  
Site Plan & Elevations  
SWC Thompson Peak & Union Hills  
Espiritu Loci Inc., Architect/Designer

35-DR-2004                      CalComp Business Park  
Site Plan & Elevations  
14555 N 82<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Tyler S Green Architect, Architect/Designer

(PULLED TO REGULAR AGENDA)

38-DR-2004                      Wollstein Property  
Elevations for Residence Remodel  
8351 E Del Camino Drive  
P/D Architects, Architect/Designer

39-DR-2004                      Alltel WCF – Desert Canyon Center  
Architectural Tower to an Existing Building  
10421 E. McDowell Mountain Ranch Rd

(PULLED TO REGULAR AGENDA)

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASES 99-DR-2003, 8-DR-2004, 23-DR-2004, 31-DR-2004, 32-DR-2004, 34-2004, AND 38-DR-2004 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. SECOND BY MR. D'ANDREA.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

**REGULAR AGENDA**

20-DR-2004                      Troon North Condominiums  
Site Plan & Elevations  
28713 N 102<sup>nd</sup> Place  
GCH Limited, Architect/Designer

**MR. VERSCHUREN** presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

**MICHEAL MANCINI**, HBT Construction, stated that he represents the applicant noting that the architect is not here so he can speak on his behalf. He described

**APPROVED 8-19-2004**

the details of the construction. He stated we have incorporated dark colors into the design but are open to changing the colors and bring them back to a study session.

**MR. JONES** stated there are an accumulation of things that would normally be acceptable but some how does not seem to have the integration and coordination that they are expecting in this area. He further stated that if he was looking at this from the developer's viewpoint he would want to try a little harder to add to the curb appeal. He remarked fewer visual elements would have more visual impact.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ** stated with regard to the fitness building and the ramada building it appears as though they have combined the storage room within the ramada building, which makes it appear rather odd. The fitness building does not seem to have the quality they would anticipate seeing in this particular area. He suggested they consider more refinement on the detail. Mr. Mancini reported we would be happy to add detail to that building. He further stated it would be preferable to be able to work with staff.

**MR. D'ANDREA** stated that he would like to reiterate what his fellow Board members have stated about the architecture on this building. He further stated he did not have a problem with the selected colors but would suggest using more color to enhance and separate the visual experience instead of viewing them as one huge complex. He added he would like to see color used to identify the units.

**MR. JONES** inquired in an effort to keep the project on track if they could approve the project with just the appearance of the building returning to the Board.

**COUNCILMAN ECTON** inquired if the issues outlined in the letter from Troon Golf Association have been addressed. Mr. Verschuren replied that the bullet points in the letter have been addressed. A few things need to be worked out between the applicants and Troon Golf Association specifically the fencing between the two, the building construction, and the easements.

(COUNCILMAN ECTON OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY)

**MICHAEL HUTCHINGS**, representing Partners in Estates, stated that he has 4 units with the golf villas directly to the north of the other side of the fairway with the intention to buy more. He inquired how high are the buildings going to be and how far is the setback from the fairway.

**MR. VERSCHUREN** stated this was previously zoned with 3-ZN-94 in that zoning case amended zoning standards were approved that allows five feet

**APPROVED 8-19-2004**

setbacks with OS zone and the height is allowed to go up to 30 feet and the applicant has chosen to go up to 30 feet.

**MR. HUTCHINGS** inquired if they would build on the elevations that the land is on now or would they lower the land. He noted that there is a big rock crop located between the first and ninth hole. Mr. Mancini replied the rock out crop would remain. The buildings on the entire site would not exceed 30 feet above natural grade.

(COUNCILMAN ECTON CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY)

**MR. SCHMITT MOVED IN RECOGNITION OF A NUMBER OF THE BOARD MEMBERS COMMENTS AND CONCERNS ABOUT COLOR AND ARCHITECTURAL DETAIL THE APPLICANT IS GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO GO BACK AND LOOK AT THE DESIGN AGAIN AND CONTINUE CASE 20-DR-2004 TO THE NEXT MEETING. SECOND BY MR. D'ANDREA.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

39-DR-2004

Alltel WCF – Desert Canyon Center  
Architectural Tower to an Existing Building  
10421 E. McDowell Mountain Ranch Rd

**MR. CURTIS** presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval. Subject to the attached stipulations.

**MR. JONES** stated this facility is close enough to his neighborhood that he runs past this site frequently. One thing that was not mentioned is this building is on the back of the site and beyond the building is approximately a 400 foot wide wash so the view from the south is from quite a distance where he felt the tower would not stand out. He further stated he thought the height was not a problem. He reported it is next to a Day Care center so if they were concerned about radiation, this would be the place to be concerned but from all of the information, he has heard these towers are not dangerous in residential areas. He concluded this request is acceptable.

(COUNCILMAN ECTON OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY)

**KOUROSH MOSHIF**, 15424 N. 106<sup>TH</sup> Place, stated that he was speaking on behalf of himself and some of the neighbors in the immediate neighborhood noting they reside across the street of the proposed antenna. He further stated that they are concerned that the antenna is not properly concealed and are providing a look for the immediate houses in the back that is industrial. The towers are clearly standing out and not part of the building. He reported they are

**APPROVED 8-19-2004**

requesting the tower be properly concealed and does not stand out as much. They have concerns about reception for their radios and TVs.

(COUNCILMAN ECTON CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY)

**COUNCILMAN ECTON** inquired if the new tower is any different than the old tower. Mr. Curtis replied the idea is for them to match exactly.

**MR. SCHMITT** inquired if the tower is attached to the building. Mr. Curtis replied in the affirmative.

**MIKE CAMPBELL**, Campbell A & Z LLC, explained that the tower would be attached to the base of the building. It will be designed to match the roof structure and design of the existing facility.

**MR. D'ANDREA** inquired if there was a reason their antenna cannot go into the existing tower. Mr. Campbell explained that the Sprint facility at the east end of the building was their first choice but they found out there was not adequate space. He reported that he received a phone call today from the McDowell Mountain Ranch HOA that they approved the design.

**COUNCILMAN ECTON** stated Mr. Mones would like to speak.

**ARTHUR MONES**, 15050 N. Thompson Peak Parkway, Unit 2067, spoke in opposition to this request. He stated this applicant is the only one who has presented a modicum of data. He further stated that this project has to be in compliance with FCC standards. The calculations done on this proposed site were done without taking into account the affect of the Sprint tower nearby. He read the section of the ordinance regarding requiring a written report verifying the maximum load.

**MR. SCHMITT MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 39-DR-2004 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS AND WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT STAFF CONFIRMS AND VERIFIES THE REGULATIONS AND ORDINANCE REQUIREMENTS ARE MET. SECOND BY MR. JONES.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

68-DR-2000#3

DHL Perimeter Center – Phase II  
Site Plan & Elevations  
8665 E. Hartford Drive  
Butler Design Group, Architect/Designer

(MR. GULINO DECLARED A CONFLICT AND DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE DISCUSSION OR VOTE.)

**APPROVED 8-19-2004**

**MR. WARD** presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval. Subject to the attached stipulations.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ** inquired if there were architectural review comments by staff regarding the lack of shading devices on the west elevations. Mr. Ward replied that he did believe there were noting this type of architecture has been reviewed under previous cases noting shade and shadow are key issues to staff. He stated these windows are set in 12 to 18 inches behind the face of the wall.

**MR. JONES MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 68-DR-2000#3. SECOND BY VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEX.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0) WITH MR. GULINO ABSTAINING.**

35-DR-2004

CalComp Business Park  
Site Plan & Elevations  
14555 N 82<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Tyler S Green Architect, Architect/Designer

**MR. WARD** presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval. Subject to the attached stipulations.

**COUNCILMAN ECTON** remarked that Mr. Ward did a great job explaining a rather common looking building.

**MR. JONES** stated that proportionally this building could be handled in a much nicer way. It appears the architect and owner attempted to fit with the context that already exists. Assuming that would be what they would want. If there is something nearby that they don't like they waive that requirement. He further stated that he would like to see another attempt in terms of changing the big stucco block floating on the little brick pilasters and a better look at the color and not match the existing buildings quite so closely.

**MR. SCHMITT** stated that he concurred with Mr. Jones. He further stated that perhaps this is a missed opportunity because the existing building is dated, and three new buildings on this site would open an opportunity in the future to face lift the existing buildings and bring it up. And let these three buildings lead the way to do that.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ** inquired if the architect presenting this information is the original design architect for the original building.

A representative of the Architect, Tyler S. Green stated that Mr. Green was not the original architect. He explained that they attempted to match the materials of

**APPROVED 8-19-2004**

the existing building. With regard to the massing of the building, the economics of the project required then to go with the box form.

**MR. JONES** explained that he did not object to the massing of the building. It is the white stucco thing sitting on the lower brick thing that matches the existing building that they felt does not need to be continued as a design style. In terms of the overall shape, position of entry and overall massing is fine; it is just the actual look of the building they are concerned with.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE, CASE 35-DR-2004 WITH THE ADDED STIPULATION THE ELEVATIONS RETURN TO THE DR BOARD FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL. SECOND BY MR. D'ANDREA.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| 11-DR-2004 | Arivest Medical Office Bldg<br>Site plan & Elevations<br>9808 N. 95 <sup>th</sup> Street<br>Cawley Architects Inc., Architect/Designer |
|------------|--|

(CONTINUED)

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| 17-DR-2004 | Main Street Mews<br>Site Plan & Elevations<br>6875 E Main Street<br>H & S International, Architect/Designer |
|------------|---|

(MR. D'ANDREA DECLARED A CONFLICT AND DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE DISCUSSION OR VOTE.)

**MR. WARD** presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval. Subject to the attached stipulations.

**IRENE CLARY**, Parklawn Homes, reviewed the details of the design. She presented a sample board of the proposed materials. She discussed how they plan on tying with the Valley Ho. She presented the Board with a book Santa Barbara Style that has a lot of elements they are proposing that shows the color more accurately.

**MR. JONES** stated that he was in Italy when this case was discussed and showed them a book of sketches that were the same style that was being presented as the regional context for Scottsdale so he noted that irony. However, they are doing it well. He further stated that he liked the colors especially the yellow. He noted that the Valley Ho is a distinct historical amenity and they should not try to match it too closely, but he would like to see things

**APPROVED 8-19-2004**



fitting comfortably in scale. He remarked that he did not know how they were providing accessibility for people in wheelchairs.

**MR. SCHMITT** stated that this project is not entirely consistent but has elements that are consistent with the downtown and he is ready to support this project.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ** thanked staff for providing the requested renderings that have allowed them to capture what will be happening. The information gives him a comfort with the overall design quality. He inquired about the lack of shading devices.

**LARRY HINE**, H & S International, presented information on the shading elements incorporated to reduce the amount of solar.

**MS. GALE** stated the tower as proposed is very bland and she hopes they will look at it. She further stated that she supports the project as presented

**MR. GULINO** stated that he supports this project acknowledging its importance to the revitalization of the downtown.

**COUNCILMAN ECTON** stated the demonstration of what they intend has been useful.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 17-DR-2004.  
SECOND BY MR. JONES.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0) WITH MR.  
D'ANDREA ABSTAINING.**

24-DR-2004

Ironstone Bank  
Site Plan & Elevations  
14650 N Northsight Blvd.  
Archicon, LC, Architect/Designer

**MR. WARD** presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval. Subject to the attached stipulations.

**KERRY KING**, Smallkane Architects, provided a brief overview of the project. He discussed the proposed colors and materials. He presented information on the massing.

**COUNCILMAN ECTON** commented that it looks like an imposing building. He inquired about the height of the ceilings in the building. Mr. King reported it is a two-story main banking lobby. He further reported that it is very important that

**APPROVED 8-19-2004**

there is visibility from the bank offices to the customers. He added that they do comply with the height requirements.

**MR. SCHMITT** stated that he likes this building it is very nicely done and the quality is a step above what is in that area. He further stated that this building is appropriate for the greater area but zooming in on this site and what is going on around this site the buildings are new and contemporary in style and this building stands away from the context around it. Mr. King stated this building has more detail and more articulation and that is appropriate for a bank. Traditionally buildings on street corners require special treatment.

Mr. Schmitt commented the description in the staff report states contemporary Mediterranean style was it the intent for this building to be contemporary or more of a period type of building. Mr. King replied that it is a blend of both.

**MR. D'ANDREA** inquired why the arches were not carried on in the drive thru area. Mr. King replied the drive-thru has three arches. Mr. D'Andrea inquired if there is a gutter system or there will be roof drains or scuppers. Mr. King stated the middle portion of the upper roof is drained internally. They have left the eaves of the building with no gutters because they thought that was a condition after staff review.

**MS. GALE** stated that she would disagree with her colleague because she felt the gutters might impact the attractiveness of that elevation for the five days a year it might be a problem. She further stated it is a elegant looking building and it can lose its dignity and glamour by becoming too colorful and she would eliminate the brightest of the terra cotta and keep the roof quiet. A stone that is more homogeneous and uniform is going to be more in keeping with the architecture of the building than having a great variety of colors. Mr. King stated they can take the range to deeper darker range. Mr. Gale stated she would warm the dirty white color up. Keep the stone quiet. Keep the roof quiet. Warm up the white.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ** stated as a banking customer he did not like the dead end parking to the drive-thru lane he would prefer to be given an option. Peter Bishop, Kimley-Horn & Associates, stated the intent to have a dead end parking to keep the traffic out of the drive-thru traffic lane. The felt this was the better circulation and provides a better customer safety.

**MR. JONES MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 24-DR-2004 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. SECOND BY MR. SCHMITT.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

Color Change to Existing Retail Center  
14672 N. Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd.

**MR. GRANT** stated the applicant wishes to continue this case in order to work out some differences with the neighbors.

**MR. D'ANDREA MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 47-DR-2004. SECOND BY MR. JONES.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

"For the Record" Court Reporters

**APPROVED 8-19-2004**